party interests. He had no taste for political controversy that turned mainly on the rivalry of ambitious leaders, or for the creation of efficient vote-getting machinery without reference to the principles and the vital issues that the votes should sustain. Perhaps his indifference to these considerations was, at times, extreme for a statesman in a democracy; but it gave to his senatorial career exceptional seriousness and dignity. From his first appearance in the debates, the lofty tone of his speeches, emphasized by graceful diction and impressive delivery, at once commanded the close attention of his colleagues on the floor and of large audiences in the galleries. Every formal speech also had much of the literary quality of a well-roumded essay on the subject under discussion; and his argument always appealed to minds capable of grasping the larger aspects of history and philosophy. Although there was no lack of satire and cutting denunciation for false theories and objectionable projects, mere personalities and unreasoned invective were disliked and avoided. Consequently Schurz early won from serious opponents a degree of respectful consideration that Sumner, popularly regarded as the leader of the Senate, had never been able to secure. The characteristic qualities of Schurz's senatorial oratory were especially manifest in his speeches on Reconstruction, and on the attempted annexation of Santo Domingo.

In the spring of 1869, eight of the eleven

secessionist
States were in normal relations with the general government,
and were politically in the hands of the Republicans, to whom,
by enfranchising the freedmen and disfranchising many
whites, Congress had given control. The remaining three
States, Virginia, Mississippi and Texas, completed the steps
necessary to readmission, and came up for formal acceptance
by Congress in the winter of 1869-70. By this time social and

[sis]